

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-8, 10-12, and 14-16 were pending. Claims 1, 3, 6, 7, 12, and 14 are canceled. Accordingly, claims 4, 5, 8, 10, 11, 15, and 16 are currently pending. No new matter has been added by the amendment. Reconsideration and reconsideration of the present application, as amended, are respectfully requested.

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the present application. The Examiner's Office Action dated July 21, 2003 has been received and the contents carefully noted.

The Examiner rejected claims 5, 8, and 16 under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Sakai (US Publication No. 2001/0012563).

Claim 5 is allowable at least for the reason that claim 5 recites a combination of features including, for example,

“...forming an antioxidant film on the surface of the metal plating layer after the impurity removing, wherein the antioxidant film forming includes coating of the surface of the metal plating layer with a metal surface treatment agent...” [emphasis added]

Claim 8 is allowable at least for the reason that claim 8 recites a combination of features including, for example,

“...forming an antioxidant film on a surface of the metal plating layer after the formation of the metal plating layer, wherein the antioxidant film forming includes coating of the surface of the metal plating layer with a metal surface treatment agent for obtaining the antioxidant film...” [emphasis added]

Claim 16 is allowable at least for the reason that claim 16 recites a combination of features including, for example,

“...forming an antioxidant film on the surface of the metal plating layer after the impurity removing, wherein the antioxidant film forming includes coating of the surface of the metal plating layer with a metal surface treatment agent for obtaining the antioxidant film...” [emphasis added]

Sakai does not teach or suggest each and every element of the claims. Specifically, Sakai discloses a laminated body including a plastic base 1, an alkyd resin undercoat 2, a silver-plated layer 3, a lower topcoat layer of polyester polyol 4, and an upper topcoat layer of polyester polyol containing a di-isocyanate 5. Washing silver nitrate and a solution of reducing agent with pure water produces the silver plated layer 3. *See* page 2, par. 0027 and page 3, par. 0038.

In contrast with the present invention, since Sakai uses pure water to remove undesired particles, Sakai cannot remove impurities that cause discoloration of the surface of the silver plating layer to a yellowish tone as discussed on page 8 of the present application. Further, in the present invention, an antioxidant film is formed on a surface of the metal plating layer by coating the surface with a metal surface treatment agent as recited in claims 5, 8, and 16. However, Sakai uses polyester polyol in lower topcoat layer 4 and upper topcoat layer 5 to coat the silver-plated layer 3, with the upper topcoat layer providing a highly smooth coating film.

However, contrary to the Examiner's statement that polyester polyol is oxidation-resistant, Applicants respectfully submit that while polyester polyol may be used as an “additive” in corrosion-resistant coatings, polyester polyol cannot be considered as an antioxidant by itself. If assuming *arguendo* that the Examiner maintains the above rejection, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner cite the specific portion of the Sakai publication that teaches this asserted feature pursuant to the requirements of 35 USC 102(e), or to a technical reference that supports the Examiner's assertion that polyester polyol is oxidation resistant.

It can thus be understood that the Sakai disclosure does not in any way anticipate the essential features of the present invention as set forth in independent claims 5, 8, and 16 as Sakai does not teach removing impurities by forming an antioxidant film on the surface of the metal plating layer with a metal surface treatment agent for obtaining the antioxidant film.


Therefore, as the cited reference fails to anticipate the present invention as recited in independent claim 5, 8, and 16, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of these claims under 35 USC 102(e) be withdrawn.

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 3, 6, 7, 12, and 13 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sakai in view of Chan (US Patent No. 5,578,347) and Burnett (US Patent No. 3,958,994). Applicants respectfully submit that this rejection is now deemed moot in view of the cancellation of these claims.

Applicants note with appreciation the allowance of claims 4, 10, 11, and 15.

In view of the above remarks, the present application is believed to be in condition for allowance. A prompt notice to that effect is respectfully requested. Permission is hereby given to charge any unforeseen fees to deposit account 50-1147.

Respectfully submitted,



David G. Posz  
Reg. No. 37,701  
Customer No. 23400

Posz & Bethards, PLC  
11250 Roger Bacon Drive, Suite 10  
Reston, VA 20190  
(703) 707-9110